

Routes to tour in Germany

The Spa Route


German roads will get you there, say to spas and health resorts spread not all over the country but along a route easily travelled and scenically attractive. From Lahnstein, opposite Koblenz, the Spa Route runs along the wooded chain of hills that border the Rhine valley. Health cures in these resorts are particularly successful in dealing with rheumatism and gynaecological disorders and cardiac and circulatory complaints. Even if you haven't enough time to take a full course of treatment, you ought to take a look at a few pump rooms and sanatoriums. In Bad Ems you must not miss the historic Inn known as the *Wirtshaus an der Lahn*. In Bad Schwalbach see for yourself the magnificent *Kursaal*. Take a walk round the Kurpark in Wiesbaden and see the city's casino. Elegant Wiesbaden dates back to the late 19th century Wilhelminian era.

Visit Germany and let the Spa Route be your guide.



- 1 Wiesbaden
- 2 Schlungenbad
- 3 Bad Ems
- 4 Bad Schwalbach

DZT DEUTSCHE ZENTRALE FÜR TOURISMUS EV
Beethovenstrasse 68, D-6000 Frankfurt/M.



The German Tribune

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF THE GERMAN PRESS

C 20725 C
ISSN 0016-8858

Bonn, 3 July 1983
Sixth year - No. 1090 - By air

Kohl not likely to mince words in Moscow

Chancellor Kohl's visit to Moscow in July comes at an awkward time. Geneva talks on missiles and missile prohibition in Europe are in full swing. Relations between the superpowers have cooled off. The chill has set in to such extent that Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko has dismissed any idea of a meeting between Presidents Andropov and Reagan as an immediate prospect. Painstaking preparations were made for a summit meeting, Mr Gromyko said. So were atmospheric improvements that Washington was not prepared to make at present.

Chancellor Kohl will make no bones about the negative aspects of relations between Bonn and Moscow during his visit to the Soviet capital. German diplomats in Moscow hint that Kohl and his Foreign Minister Genscher, will be telling the Soviet leaders what doesn't satisfy them.

The Chancellor will be stressing his interest in good relations with the Soviet Union even if missile moderation goes ahead.

The same sources suggest that Bonn would prefer the Chancellor's visit not to be overshadowed by the missile issue.

IN THIS ISSUE

- Chancellor's first term in charge: Page 4
- There's no one else in sight
- ECONOMY Page 6
- Interest rates over-rated
- a recovery killer
- RESEARCH Page 8
- German students' hopes in
- stirring drum
- GERMAN LIVING Page 15
- Changing political mould
- minor groupings

Next edition of THE GERMAN TRIBUNE will appear on 17 July.

Dominated by the missiles issue, though the Geneva INF talks are sure to be a major item on the agenda of several days of talks.

It is felt to be unfair for the Soviet Union to behave as though the stationing of new missiles were a matter of life and death, of war or peace.

In the Soviet Union, it is argued, has threatened the Federal Republic of Germany with its own SS-4 missiles since

despite this threat relations between the two countries have been good. This threat the Moscow treaties assigned.

Kohl is expected to reject the

absolute character of Soviet security policy, and he is expecting the Soviet Union to honour his firm stand with a willingness to compromise.

The Chancellor is likely to hold separate talks with Mr Andropov, Prime Minister Tikhonov and Defence Minister Ustinov.

In each case missile experts from both sides will be present, but it is hoped that the missiles issue will not predominate.

Bonn wants to make it clear to the Soviet Union that the security policy measures it feels are right ought not to be made subject to the future of bilateral ties.

Chancellor Kohl's government is keen to maintain good relations.

The negative aspects of bilateral ties include, as the Chancellor sees it, the decline in the number of ethnic Germans to the granted visas to leave the Soviet Union and start life afresh in the Federal Republic of Germany.

This "sad chapter" in bilateral ties, as one German diplomat puts it, will be given a forthright mention by Chancellor Kohl in view of the burden it imposes on ties between Bonn and Moscow.

His predecessors Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt preferred not to over-emphasise the issue. They tried to solve the problem by means of quiet diplomacy.

In the first six months of 1983 only 594 ethnic Germans have been issued with exit visas by the Soviet authorities. The figure last year was 1,196. Over 100,000 are felt to be still keen to migrate. Neither political nor economic agree-



Fireside chat

President Reagan (left) and the Governing Mayor of West Berlin, Richard von Weizsäcker, at the White House. The special problems of Berlin and the Geneva disarmament talks were among the topics during von Weizsäcker's four-day visit.

Kohl is expected to reject the



American Vice-President George Bush (left) with Bonn President Karl Carstens. Mr Bush was in the Federal Republic to take part in 300th anniversary celebrations to mark the first German settlers to arrive in America (Story this page). (Photo: Sven Simon)

A reflection of German public opinion

Vice-President Bush of America, President Carstens and Chancellor Kohl attended a special ceremony in Krefeld in honour of the 300th anniversary of the first German settlers in America.

Mr Bush was welcomed by 100,000 Krefeld people, 20,000 members of the peace movement demonstrated peacefully against the arms race and 1,000 demonstrators (at most) ran riot.

These figures are probably an accurate reflection of German opinion on ties with the United States and on armaments. The number of militant trouble-makers is very small yet they hit the headlines.

This conveys a distorted picture of the situation in the Federal Republic and an inaccurate image of the peace movement, which thus tends to be seen as entirely violent, Communist-run and completely anti-American.

German-American friendship, which the tricentennial celebrations are intended to reaffirm, developed in the special circumstances of the post-war period.

Yet the Western alliance remains the cornerstone on which the Federal Republic's policies are based; and election results emphasise how few people would like to see Bonn pull out of Nato.

The fear of a nuclear arms race is much more widespread. Reaffirmation of German-American friendship, as in Krefeld, would be misunderstood if it were taken to mean automatic approval of arms policies of any kind.

Bonn may abide by its Nato commit-

Continued on page 2

WORLD AFFAIRS

Euro missiles:
would a
plebiscite help?

A Constitutional Court judge, Helmut Simon, has suggested that a referendum be held on the issue of whether missiles should be stationed in Germany. His suggestion was aimed at helping to relax domestic political tension.

What is the point of a referendum? Judge Simon's proposal is for a consultative referendum, which by definition would not be binding on the Bundestag.

If it were held, either the Bundestag or a sufficiently large number of people (the crucial factor in any legal arrangement) could insist on a referendum before any specific major political decision was taken.

But the result of the referendum would merely serve as a basis for further discussion and not be binding on bodies constitutionally entrusted with the task of reaching final decisions.

Yet the closer one scrutinises the idea of a consultative referendum to offset the lack of provisions for a plebiscite in Basic Law, the 1949 Bonn constitution, the more heavily the counter-arguments seem to weigh.

A merely consultative referendum would run the risk of making the gap in political legitimacy that was to be bridged even wider.

What, for instance, if the referendum were to go against stationing the new missiles in Germany but the government and the Bundestag were to give it the go-ahead, which they would still be entitled to do?

It would be an unenviable choice. Either the will of the people would be disregarded or it would have to be admitted that the leeway allegedly to be retained by constitutional organs had become a sheer farce.

What issues would be liable to be dealt with in a referendum: whether foreign residents should be allowed to stay in Germany, for instance?

What if the people were to be asked two different questions simultaneously that had been demagogically reduced to a seemingly simple alternative?

This is not even to mention the fact that opinion polls can establish exactly what views the public hold on a given issue as it is.

Helmut Simon is a staunch supporter of constitutional freedom. Only someone who did not know him could possibly imagine he was unaware of all these problems.

He himself admits that his proposal is a makeshift solution, so those who dislike it will at least appreciate that even Judge Simon realises it is far from perfect.

Limits are everywhere in evidence: in security policy, atomic energy, ecology as a whole, scarce resources, genetic engineering and so on.

They cannot be overstepped without letting chaos loose. Trial and error as the path to progress are no longer appropriate. Even a single error could be the last.

So it seems reasonable to ask whether there might not be issues on which a majority cannot be in favour today and against tomorrow.

That is why some people, including another judge, feel the missile debate

is not a political issue. It is, they argue, a matter of life and death.

Even though this argument elevates a partial aspect of security policy to the level of the absolute without due cause the idea fairly underlines the finite nature of political processes.

The problem is that this realisation of constitutional limits can lead to diametrically opposite conclusions.

While one may argue that the majority mechanism breaks down on certain issues it is also true that in the final analysis all political issues amount to a choice between yes and no, between majority and minority.

Even if Helmut Simon were right in saying that the death penalty is another issue on which a political vote is impossible he would have to admit that it was abolished by a political vote.

It follows that in situations in which majority decisions are extremely controversial the majority and minority are even more heavily committed to mediation and to reach an understanding.

There must be neither a high-handed use of the majority position nor an arbitrary decision to pull out of the constitutional set-up.

When a majority vote is imminent that is going to make heavy demands on the minority because it is of such fundamental significance the majority is duty-bound to state its case and be ready to discuss matters.

This is the time for the full extent of debate that justifies democracy over and above its formal procedures. The majority never rules; it merely governs.

That, perhaps, is the main point. Helmut Simon has sought to make with his dubious proposal for a referendum. If it is, it is a valid one.

Robert Leicht
(Süddeutsche Zeitung, 20 June 1983)

Continued from page 1

ments and agree if need be to the stationing of new US missiles in Germany, but it will do so solely because it realises it has to. The aim is still to end the arms race.

The German government must continue to stress the need for results at Geneva. Friendship with America need hardly suffer from constant reminders that this must be the target.

Ralf Lehmann
(Westdeutsche Allgemeine, 1983)

Polish officials breathe easy
again as the Pope departs

Top-ranking officials of the Communist regime in Warsaw must have breathed a sigh of relief when the Pope reached the end of his visit to Poland and flew back to Rome.

This relief may well have been shared by Western politicians who feared that in the wake of the Pope's visit uncontrollable mass reactions might prompt harsh counter-measures by the Polish security forces.

In Nova Huta tens of thousands of Poles demonstrated in support of the banned Solidarity trade union while the notorious security police looked on in unaccustomed idleness.

Any dramatic development in this connection would have strengthened the hand of opponents of the Pope's visit among doctrinaire Party officials and weakened that of General Jaruzelski and Communist reformers led by Vice-Premier Rakowski.

The visit gave millions of Poles an opportunity of demonstrating to the

world at large their religious convictions (political too, under an atheist regime).

They were the Papal "divisions" about which Stalin sarcastically inquired, and Polish Communists will have their work cut out countering the effect of the Pope's sermons.

Moscow has been tellingly tipped off about the entire business so far.

Yet the visit upgraded the Polish military regime, which was previously internationally isolated, and General Jaruzelski personally too.

His invitation to the Pope was a dangerous and daring decision that could yet play a part in defusing Poland's deep-seated contradictions even though the dialogue might initially be limited to Party and Church.

This being so, an easing of Western sanctions could strengthen the position of Polish moderates.

(Der Tagespiegel, 24 June 1983)

Expenditure on armaments
'just keeps growing'

Between 1979 and 1982 world arms expenditure increased by 4 per cent a year, twice the rate of the previous four years.

That is one of the findings of the 14th survey of arms and disarmament published by the International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Stockholm.

The 1983 report expects no immediate results at the main Geneva disarmament talks on intermediate nuclear forces and strategic arms reduction.

It is a report that will not disappoint the pessimists. Its findings do not support any hopes of making peace with fewer weapons. On the contrary.

Military spending is said to have increased by leaps and bounds. So have the development and production of new weapons, the arms trade and the development of sea and space as theatres for the next war.

As for positive developments in arms control and disarmament, the SIPRI findings are short and anything but sweet: there have been none.

Even a rough and ready look at the facts ought to make advocates of security policy along mainly military lines think twice.

Between 1979 and 1982 arms expenditure increased by four per cent per annum, or roughly twice as fast as during the previous four years.

SIPRI estimates total arms spending in 1982 to have amounted to between \$700bn and \$750bn. The international arms trade is still booming, having achieved a growth rate of 80 per cent since 1978.

In 1982 the United States carried out 17 nuclear tests, the largest series since 1970, while the Soviet Union's 31 nuclear tests were the largest number in any one year since 1963.

British and French arms programmes, if they go ahead according to plan, are likely to increase the number of Anglo-French missile warheads aimed at targets in the Soviet Union from 386 to roughly 2,000 over the next 15 years.

The head of SIPRI, Frank Blackaby, urgently notes the problems the British

and French systems create for Geneva talks.

The Soviet Union demands inclusion in any agreement between East and West.

"In relation to the balance between East and West," he says, "the arguments for excluding the USSR are weak."

"It is merely playing with words," he says, "as they are national, strategic weapons, the SS-20s and the Pershing and Cruise missiles."

"Britain and France are under a delusion if they think they can increase the number of heads aimed at targets in the Soviet Union without prompting a reaction."

The SIPRI authors are not any immediate outcome at the current Geneva talks on INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces), and Start, (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks).

They blame political terms of balance-of-power there is no justification in terms.

They say the Start talks will long time, whereas any success at the INF talks will be under way.

The stationing of large numbers of new US missiles in Western Europe will mark a new stage in the arms race between NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

SIPRI expects some progress on governments by the present moment. Politicians are having public opinion in mind more before.

But the public will need to be comprehensively informed and, as one of the SIPRI Yearbook authors says, they have come up time against the limits of official secrecy.

An increasing number of people interested in the subject will be in a position to read the detailed information listed in the yearbook.

Once again no German publication felt able to run the risk of a German edition of this 700-page yearbook.

The Bonn government could not for a translation with the usual Federal Political Education but Bonn is unlikely to want to grow even more sensitive to the issue.

Karl-Heinz Hoffmann
(Deutsches Allgemeines, 24 June 1983)

The German Tribune

Publisher: Friedrich Rückes, Editor: Hans-Joachim Vogel, Sub-editor: Jürgen Böttcher, Distribution: Georgina Phipps, Friedrich Rückes Verlag GmbH, 23 Hamburg 78, Tel. 22 85 1, Telex: 20-1472.

Advertising rates: Net 16. — Annual subscription: DM 45.

Printed by Druck- und Verlagsanstalt Friedrich Rückes, Hamburg, in cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany. They are complete translations of the original text and are not to be used for any other purpose.

All articles which THE GERMAN TRIBUNE publishes in cooperation with the original author are published in the original language. They are complete translations of the original text and are not to be used for any other purpose.

In all correspondence please quote your name, address and the name of the newspaper, which appears on the wrapper. Articles, above your address.

HOME AFFAIRS

Plain speaking
on issue of
Germany

Chancellor Helmut Kohl's Bonn government is not so worried about the feeling of the German Democratic Republic as was the former East team.

The government is intent on maintaining a policy of encouraging talks and reconciliation. But it is less inclined to words about the problems.

Chancellor Kohl made his first of-the-nation address in the Bundestag at the end of June, the speech given its full original title: Report of the State of the Nation in Divided Germany.

It restores the latter part of the title which had been dropped during the Bonn era.

Kohl's speech and subsequent speeches by Alfred Dregger, leader of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, and Intra-German Affairs Minister, Heinrich Windelen, greater emphasis put on the problems of a divided Germany than other governments.

Prospects for cooperation have not worsened since the change in Bonn. The current plain speaking only means that false hopes are not raised.

But over the next few years efforts by Bonn to steady its own budget will mean that East Berlin will not be able to expect too much, certainly no expensive transport schemes.

Kohl pointed out that inner-German trade went up by 13 per cent last year and the government wants to increase that. There is also interest in cooperation in energy and ecology policies.

Travelling difficulties and obligatory currency exchange for visitors to the GDR remain big problems.

Hans Jörg Sottorf
(Hamburger Abendblatt, 24 June 1983)

German presidency of the EEC was a "presidency of lost opportunities," according to an SPD member of the Bundestag.

Karl Hauff, said in a debate on the European summit, that the German presidency of the EEC was a "presidency of lost opportunities," according to an SPD member of the Bundestag.

Hauff commented that the only positive thing about Stuttgart was the fact that the meeting did not end with a quarrel.

"But that is not enough to overcome the resignation and weariness with regard to Europe."

Petra Kelly, of the Greens, sharply criticised Bonn's policy towards Europe.

The question must be asked whether the "ceremonial declaration" agreed on in Stuttgart is not the work of cynics in the face of the existing waste of raw materials, unemployment and major projects.

The FDP objected to the Opposition's "belly-aching."

Carl Otto Lenz, speaking for the joint CDU/CSU parliamentary group, praised the way the Chancellor conducted the negotiations in Stuttgart.

However, he did add: "We ought not rest on the laurels of Stuttgart."

Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that the criticism by the SPD should be levelled against the Socialist International, in those countries where its members are in government.

They exert a negative influence on European policy.

Bernd Conrad
(Die Welt, 23 June 1983)

the GDR in the interests of peace. A policy of seeking dialogue and reconciliation will be continued.

The deterioration of the political climate following the deaths on the German-German border and the cancellation of the visit to West Germany by East German leader, Erich Honecker, have not adversely affected the interest shown by the GDR in maintaining discussions with the Federal Republic.

Even the emotional discussion on the missile deployment issue cannot change this fact.

Soon after Honecker had turned down the invitation to visit the Federal Republic, he stated that the visit has only been postponed.

The GDR economics official, Günter Mittag, virtually said the same thing during talks in Bonn.

The head of the CDU/CSU parliamentary group, Alfred Dregger, remarked that he was most impressed by the talks with Mittag. Dregger will probably soon visit East Germany.

The GDR is primarily hoping for economic and financial benefits in its dealing with the Federal Republic.

Under the symbolic umbrella of unity (disputed by the GDR), the GDR benefits from EEC's customs concessions.

Prospects for cooperation have not worsened since the change in Bonn. The current plain speaking only means that false hopes are not raised.

But over the next few years efforts by Bonn to steady its own budget will mean that East Berlin will not be able to expect too much, certainly no expensive transport schemes.

Kohl pointed out that inner-German trade went up by 13 per cent last year and the government wants to increase that. There is also interest in cooperation in energy and ecology policies.

Travelling difficulties and obligatory currency exchange for visitors to the GDR remain big problems.

Hans Jörg Sottorf
(Hamburger Abendblatt, 24 June 1983)

Euro policies
spark clash
in Bundestag

liberate efforts towards European solidarity.

"In Stuttgart we made the decisions which could be expected of us at this time."

In Kohl's opinion, it is most unrealistic to expect such a summit meeting to solve the problems of future Community, financing, budgetary discipline, and the adjustment of the Common Agricultural Policy "for all ten summit nations at the same time and once and for all."

The Council has set deadlines and it is hoped that the desired results will be obtained soon.

The Stuttgart "package deal" takes into account the German desire for a more limited budgetary dynamics, financial cutbacks and restructuring.

Future negotiations on this point are likely to be difficult, said the Chancellor. There are only thin chances of success if such negotiations are carried out in a mood of mutual trust and a spirit of solidarity.

Kohl described the following as successes during the German presidency: the reform of the social fund, improvement of goods traffic, and the completion of work on the guideline program.

During such times, national interests emerge more strongly and clash more sharply," he said. "The cushion of security has become thinner. Such a situation demands greater and more de-

Minister's remark changes
Kohl's debate plans

It looks as if Bonn's Minister for Youth, Family Affairs and Health, Heiner Geissler, messed up Chancellor Kohl's original plan for delivering the state-of-the-nation address in the Bundestag.

The thoughtless and historically untenable remark by Geissler that pacifism during the 1930s can be claimed to be responsible for the fact that such a thing as mass murder could occur in Auschwitz meant that Chancellor Kohl was forced to change his programme.

He was hoping to show Parliament and the public what his *Deutschlandpolitik* would look like during his period in office as Chancellor.

However, the Opposition took advantage of Geissler's faux pas and redirected a great deal of the content and style of the subsequent debate on the state-of-the-nation speech.

It was clear right from the start that the SPD's demand for Geissler's dismissal as Minister had no chance of being successful. The Free Democrats were not interested in leaving Geissler standing out in the cold when it came to the final vote.

The only FDP Bundestag member to abstain was Hildegarde Hamm-Brücher.

Nevertheless, Opposition leader Hans-Jochen Vogel and his team did score other successes during the debate.

They managed to get the discussion on Geissler's slip-up onto the agenda during the best TV-viewing time.

They forced the Chancellor to make his way to the rostrum a second time just after he had sat down after making his policy speech. He was obliged to protect and support his Minister, who was under fire from almost all sides.

Hans-Jochen Vogel: "I don't wish to associate Heiner Geissler and your party with neo-Nazi activities, but..."

Or Parliamentary Secretary Fischer from the Greens: "Did Hitler come to power with the help of foreign countries, or wasn't it more a case of support from your German National predecessors, the Hugenburgs and Papens, the Krupps and the Flicks?"

Such comments were, of course, bound to lead to emotional scenes.

The Chancellor retorted: "We have no need to prove that we know what democracy and anti-Nazi attitudes mean," or "neither the chairman of the CDU nor the general secretary of this party need prove this to anyone. Their own life histories speak for themselves."

In the end, Geissler did back down the way he should have done a week ago.

The Minister admitted that he should have rounded off his remarks by adding that racial hatred and National Socialism were really to blame for Auschwitz.

Geissler went even further. In his opinion, it would have been better not to have mentioned Auschwitz at all. Instead, he should have said that the pacifist mood prevalent in western democracies during the 30s made the "war" possible in the first place.

Too late. The term "Auschwitz" has now become a part of the current political discussion in Germany.

The unfortunate thing is that Geissler didn't use the expression first. He was only referring to a statement made by the Greens in an interview when he made his remark.

The Greens regard the coming deployment of Nato defence policy as a possible "nuclear Auschwitz."

This virtually puts Nato defence policy on the same level as the Nazi war crimes.

Gisbert Kuhn
(Kleiner Nachrichten, 24 June 1983)

■ PEOPLE

Vogel's first term in charge: there's no one else in sight



Hans-Jochen Vogel, the leader of the SPD parliamentary group in the Bundestag since 8 March, has avoided making any serious mistakes during his first 100 days as Opposition leader.

"I expected to come up against big, very big problems...", Vogel admits. "In terms of those expectations, things have gone pretty well."

Although Vogel's appraisal of his own performance since his party's general election defeat sounds rather restrained, there is no trace of faint-heartedness.

Just one week before the Bundestag's summer recess, Vogel feels that he has done a good job and has "kept the outfit together". This is more than many pessimists had predicted.

The Social Democratic Party, which lost a great deal of support during the March elections, is still in the process of waking up to new political realities. After 16 years in government, the new role of Opposition party takes some getting used to.

Even leading politicians in the party's parliamentary group are still adjusting. The general mood within the party is still a mixture of praise, criticism, resignation and enthusiasm.

Vogel remains through it all a rock of stability. Is he the SPD's one-man band?

Vogel is aware of the complicated and jumbled-up situation in his party, but he is not too keen to call a spade a spade.

Some of his party colleagues, who wish to remain nameless, criticise his style of leadership or complain about his political vision.

Others are equally vehement in their enthusiasm and support for his style and mannerisms.

It is difficult to get a clear picture of Vogel's popularity within his own party. Remarks made by two of the party's top-level politicians prove the point. One refers to the "very good mood" within the party, whereas the other states that the SPD's parliamentary group is "about to explode".

The truth of the matter is that there is at present no alternative in the SPD to Hans-Jochen Vogel, whose predecessor as parliamentary party leader was the "old man" of German politics, Herbert Wehner.

This is why criticism is being toned down and praise is being given freely.

When asked to give a rundown of his "acid text", Vogel referred to the fact that during his period as Opposition leader in Berlin's House of Representatives he only had 50 politicians to lead. In the Bundestag there are 201.

It's certainly not easy to carry on where Herbert Wehner left off.

After all, four fifths of the Social Democrats in the Bundestag have never experienced what it is like to be in an Opposition party.

After being ousted from government, there was a great danger that the party would wallow in self-criticism and even start tearing itself apart.

Vogel sees himself as in the main a man of the executive. In the face of the post-election uncertainties, he has focussed more attention on getting to grips with the party's organisational structures than many believe necessary.

Against substantial opposition, centred around Hans Apel, he pushed through an organisation model which tailored the party's political leadership to his own person and eight deputies. These eight shadow ministers are responsible for the parliamentary party's political activities.

In addition, there are five parliamentary secretaries. Together with the eight shadow ministers and Vogel himself, they form the parliamentary party executive, the Opposition real decision-making body.

Many party colleagues refer to this mode of organisation as "departmental administration", a play on the Vogel's Berlin days. In Berlin, he was accustomed to having a party apparatus beneath him, rather than having to come to terms with men and women of an equal parliamentary status.

The pressure to conform to his hierarchical set-up seems to be one of the major internal problems in the SPD parliamentary party, although Vogel's intention is not to suppress originality.

Among the circle of Vogel's closest colleagues, there is a down-to-earth assessment of the new leadership structure: "We can react much faster politically than we used to; we can recognise internal conflicts and solve them much earlier."

However, the centralist structure does run the risk of allowing only the eight top politicians to get publicity, whereas the non-prominent members of the party find it more difficult to gain attention.

Many feel that the flexibility shown by Vogel on this point will decide on Vogel's success in the long run. "The man is used to monocratic rule."

**6 It looks as though
chance is the
thing he is most
frightened of**

structures; now, he's surrounded by people who have gathered their own political experience... He should perhaps show greater confidence in their abilities. This will make or break him in the long run."

Vogel is a punctuality fanatic, a workaholic and an ardent letter-writer. He prefers to jot down notes rather than rely on his memory.

Although he has a comital way about him, he is mainly concerned about the issues at stake.

In a nutshell, Vogel is no easy boss. His fellow Social Democrats have got used to this, even though they still moan and groan as they always have done.

Vogel is convinced that bureaucratic organisation is a means of making more controllable a political structure which is difficult to control.

Horst Ehmke, one of Vogel's eight deputies, and a man who brims over

with self-confidence, is "quite satisfied" with the system of organisation. In his words, Vogel is doing a "pretty good job politically", which is praise indeed from the otherwise restrained Ehmke. As Ehmke points out, anyone who wants to convince him (Ehmke) of the necessity of a particular political move must be willing to discuss it openly. Many see Ehmke as Vogel's right-hand man, although officially there is no such thing. Are the majority of Social Democrats in the Bundestag as satisfied with Vogel as Ehmke is? There are of course various groupings. The former strong arm of the parliamentary party, the so-called *Kanalarbeiter* group, still exists but has become weaker.

Ever since the personnel struggles have become less important, and as Herta and Pauline remarks "more time is spent talking about issues rather than personalities", the internal formation of party opinion moves along new lines.

The right-wing and the left-wing seem to have become weaker, the "centre" appears to have gained in strength. The influence of Hans Apel, as intellectual spokesman for a centre-right movement, should not be underestimated here.

There are irreconcilabilities on both sides. Herta Dübler-Gmellin (left-wing): "Apel? Yes, a definitely pleasant character."

Gerhard Schröder, another party left-winger, also had nothing critical to say about Hans-Jochen Vogel: "I really like his style."

In Schröder's opinion, the way the party discussed the missile deployment issue was a prime example of this new style. Vogel gives "other opinions a fair chance", "doesn't steamroller his opponents", "handles opposition very well", "shows a clear political intention". Schröder feels that Vogel should "keep to his present style."

And as if this weren't enough praise, Schröder advises him not to "take the vanities of his subleaders into consideration."

Although prestige plays a part in the different assessments of Vogel by his colleagues in the parliamentary party, the motives are also connected with the differing opinions on issues.

Many party colleagues who object to Vogel's political style are really objecting to the political course he is taking.

It could be described as a "course of integration", once a stumbling-block for party chairman Willy Brandt, and felt by many to have too much of a leaning to the left. In fact, some feel that Vogel is leading the party towards



Across the big divide... Hans-Jochen Vogel (left) and Helmut Kohl.

a (left-wing) fringe area of ideas.

The internal dispute which tries to describe the relationship to the peace movement has been covered up by Vogel's position.

Together with the immediate image for the SPD of the new party in Opposition.

This accounts for the hesitations, which motions, Parliamentary and draft bills have been laid on the Bundestag.

Busy-beavering by the SPD and the other Opposition party, the standing in the wings.

However, there is still a great uncertainty as to what is going to happen next year, after the year 1983 is over.

Many talk of the elaboration of a modern economic and social common Agricultural Policy, the other structural crisis.

At the moment, there is no seeking new parliamentary Grand Coalition is only a matter of time.

Next year, Vogel will be taking the deputy chairmanship of the from Helmut Schmidt. This will, however, strengthen his position.

In his reply to Chancellor policy speech on 4 May, Vogel assured that the SPD was returning to government solely as a result of a catastrophe.

"We are going to practice open not obstruction", he said.

Vogel is probably hoping for cooperation with his own party group will be equally constructive.

With an eye to the fact that party member is bothered by bureaucratic approach and form he says: "Organic does not prevent creativity, it chance developments."

And it looks as though change thing Hans-Jochen Vogel is most of most.

Martin E. Schuler
(Süddeutsche Zeitung)

THE EEC

Leaders cobble together a massive all-or-nothing package deal

Common Market leaders have put together the biggest package of the European Community has had to handle.

The package was put together at the summit. Several parts are in the air.

Each part now depends on the whole, including the DM1.7bn rebate on Britain's contribution to the 1983 EEC budget.

An agreement is not reached on the package by December, the deadline for the 1984 budget, Britain's rebate probably needs to be shelved too.

The package also exists between ratification of the new EEC financial framework and ratification of membership for Spain and Portugal.

Both are to be submitted simultaneously to national parliaments. EEC leaders were confident in Stuttgart that it would be the case by mid-1984.

The five problems tied up in a single package in Stuttgart were:

- the future of the European Community's finances;
- the development of Community policies;
- issues related to expansion of the Common Market;
- "special problems of a number of member-states in the budgetary sector," which means the fact that Britain and Germany pay much more into the EEC than they get back; and
- the economy package, or as the communiqué put it, "the need for strict budgetary discipline."

The order in which they are listed is not accidental and in no way indicative of their importance. The Stuttgart communiqué hardly said to specify details to the Council of Ministers.

The targets are listed. How they are achieved is left to be seen. It will be up to the European Commission to get to work on them.

It has been instructed to draft two proposals by the beginning of August on the EEC's summer recess starts.

One is to deal with a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, the other with possible changes to the regional social fund and structural aid to agriculture.

Greece, as chairman of the Common Market in the second half of 1983, is unlikely to be able to hold the first special session of the Council of Ministers before the recess.

The main objective of reforms as envisaged in the summit communiqué is to modernise existing policies and make them more effective.

On the one hand to lay down priority sectors for further moves by the Community while on the other hand ensuring that policies are carried out at no further cost and money wherever possible.

On the individual parts of the package the communiqué has this to say:

Future finances: The extent and timing of Community fund requirements are to be ascertained on the basis of results yet to be accomplished (new policies, budgetary discipline etc.).

In other words, the increase in VAT contributions to Brussels on which the Commission is so keen will be the last item on the agenda.

A number of Common Market countries would have been prepared to increase their contributions to the EEC immediately.

The main opponents were Britain and Germany, although both were persuaded to indicate that they would be prepared to go ahead with any increase in VAT revenue on which the Ten might agree.

The Stuttgart summit resolved to promote further EEC activities in research, innovation and new technologies. The heads of government for one felt collaboration would cut out duplication.

By ending duplication in research work governments would be making a contribution to more effective use of public money.

They would also be helping to improve the competitiveness of European companies, as for instance by means of the Esprit programme (short for European Special Programme for Research and Development in Information Technology).

In response to a special request by both Germany and France the following passage was included in the Stuttgart communiqué:

"Environmental protection, employment opportunities, especially for the young, and welfare policies are to be given equal priority."

No mention was made of anything more specific.

● Issues related to Common Market expansion: This mainly means protection of farmers in Italy, southern France and Greece once Spain and Portugal join the EEC.

The amount of Mediterranean products marketed within the EEC will increase dramatically once Spain and Portugal join.

Farmers are worried prices might plummet and clamour for price guarantees similar to those available for agricultural produce further north, such as milk and wheat.

Here too the summit communiqué does not go into details.

● The contribution problems of Britain and Germany: The aim, in summiteese, is "to arrive at measures that on balance prevent the constantly recurring problems between member-countries on the financial repercussions of the Community budget and its financing."

Several strategies are under consideration. The EEC budget will need to be rejigged in such a way to ensure that two thirds does not go on the Common Agricultural policy.

Britain derives very little benefit from the existing system because it exports very little farm produce and imports a great deal.

Another approach would be to graduate the funds remitted by individual countries to Brussels in accordance with "objective criteria," such as GNP or agricultural output.

There must definitely be no more annual debates on the amount Britain is to be reimbursed and how much Germany is to contribute toward the rebate.

● Stricter budgetary discipline: The main sector in which discipline needs enforcing is agriculture.

Common Market leaders are agreed that the fundamental principles of agricultural policy ought to be retained, but they would like to see effective control of agricultural spending.

No specific reference was made to a reduction. All that was said in the communiqué was that:

"All member-countries must make their contribution toward the savings that need to be effected."

Views differ on how the Common Agricultural Policy can be changed. On this point the debate is evidently back to square one.

Germany would very much like to amend price policies, guarantees for individual products or make producers partly responsible.

In other words, farmers would have to foot part of the bill for surplus production.

The French favour a different approach. They note that the market prospects for European fodder grain are hit by high imports of soya products from overseas.

So they would like to see import restrictions imposed on soybean products, which would be sure to rouse America's ire.

These examples indicate that there are a number of ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy could be amended. The summit communiqué lists them but does not state a preference.

muniqué was that: "All member-countries must make their contribution toward the savings that need to be effected."

Views differ on how the Common Agricultural Policy can be changed. On this point the debate is evidently back to square one.

Germany would very much like to amend price policies, guarantees for individual products or make producers partly responsible.

In other words, farmers would have to foot part of the bill for surplus production.

The French favour a different approach. They note that the market prospects for European fodder grain are hit by high imports of soya products from overseas.

So they would like to see import restrictions imposed on soybean products, which would be sure to rouse America's ire.

These examples indicate that there are a number of ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy could be amended. The summit communiqué lists them but does not state a preference.

Another approach would be to graduate the funds remitted by individual countries to Brussels in accordance with "objective criteria," such as GNP or agricultural output.

There must definitely be no more annual debates on the amount Britain is to be reimbursed and how much Germany is to contribute toward the rebate.

● Stricter budgetary discipline: The main sector in which discipline needs enforcing is agriculture.

Common Market leaders are agreed that the fundamental principles of agricultural policy ought to be retained, but they would like to see effective control of agricultural spending.

No specific reference was made to a reduction. All that was said in the communiqué was that:

"All member-countries must make their contribution toward the savings that need to be effected."

Views differ on how the Common Agricultural Policy can be changed. On this point the debate is evidently back to square one.

Germany would very much like to amend price policies, guarantees for individual products or make producers partly responsible.

In other words, farmers would have to foot part of the bill for surplus production.

The French favour a different approach. They note that the market prospects for European fodder grain are hit by high imports of soya products from overseas.

So they would like to see import restrictions imposed on soybean products, which would be sure to rouse America's ire.

These examples indicate that there are a number of ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy could be amended. The summit communiqué lists them but does not state a preference.

Another approach would be to graduate the funds remitted by individual countries to Brussels in accordance with "objective criteria," such as GNP or agricultural output.

There must definitely be no more annual debates on the amount Britain is to be reimbursed and how much Germany is to contribute toward the rebate.

● Stricter budgetary discipline: The main sector in which discipline needs enforcing is agriculture.

Common Market leaders are agreed that the fundamental principles of agricultural policy ought to be retained, but they would like to see effective control of agricultural spending.

No specific reference was made to a reduction. All that was said in the communiqué was that:

muniqué was that: "All member-countries must make their contribution toward the savings that need to be effected."

Views differ on how the Common Agricultural Policy can be changed. On this point the debate is evidently back to square one.

Germany would very much like to amend price policies, guarantees for individual products or make producers partly responsible.

In other words, farmers would have to foot part of the bill for surplus production.

The French favour a different approach. They note that the market prospects for European fodder grain are hit by high imports of soya products from overseas.

So they would like to see import restrictions imposed on soybean products, which would be sure to rouse America's ire.

These examples indicate that there are a number of ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy could be amended. The summit communiqué lists them but does not state a preference.

Another approach would be to graduate the funds remitted by individual countries to Brussels in accordance with "objective criteria," such as GNP or agricultural output.

There must definitely be no more annual debates on the amount Britain is to be reimbursed and how much Germany is to contribute toward the rebate.

● Stricter budgetary discipline: The main sector in which discipline needs enforcing is agriculture.

Common Market leaders are agreed that the fundamental principles of agricultural policy ought to be retained, but they would like to see effective control of agricultural spending.

No specific reference was made to a reduction. All that was said in the communiqué was that:

"All member-countries must make their contribution toward the savings that need to be effected."

Views differ on how the Common Agricultural Policy can be changed. On this point the debate is evidently back to square one.

Germany would very much like to amend price policies, guarantees for individual products or make producers partly responsible.

In other words, farmers would have to foot part of the bill for surplus production.

The French favour a different approach. They note that the market prospects for European fodder grain are hit by high imports of soya products from overseas.

So they would like to see import restrictions imposed on soybean products, which would be sure to rouse America's ire.

These examples indicate that there are a number of ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy could be amended. The summit communiqué lists them but does not state a preference.

Another approach would be to graduate the funds remitted by individual countries to Brussels in accordance with "objective criteria," such as GNP or agricultural output.

There must definitely be no more annual debates on the amount Britain is to be reimbursed and how much Germany is to contribute toward the rebate.

● Stricter budgetary discipline: The main sector in which discipline needs enforcing is agriculture.

Common Market leaders are agreed that the fundamental principles of agricultural policy ought to be retained, but they would like to see effective control of agricultural spending.

No specific reference was made to a reduction. All that was said in the communiqué was that:

Continued on page 8

American bid to get farm subsidies cut

ally and what it costs EEC taxpayers, but they are keenly interested in what the European Community gets up to in world markets.

If only there were no sales guarantees, they say, supply and demand would regulate the market and strike a relative balance, with the least expensive producer invariably prevailing in a free market.

This sounds fine and in theory is absolutely right. Common Market consumers would certainly be able to buy food much cheaper than at present, probably at prices as low as they always have been for consumers in the United States.

But the equation only works when agriculture is viewed solely in economic terms. In Europe there are sound reasons for bearing sociological, political and ecological aspects in mind too.

The structure of European agriculture is anything but satisfactory. In the United States only 2.7 per cent of the population earn their living from farming. In the Common Market the average is 13 per cent or so.

The Americans are not interested in what the Common Market does inter-

In southern regions of the EEC in particular there are still far too many smallholdings that are not going to survive in the long run.

This structure, which has taken shape over the centuries, is in need of revision, but it must not be done at the stroke of a pen.

Care must be taken to develop rural areas economically and industrially in such a way as to ensure that ex-farmers are not uprooted and are assured of social safeguards.

The aim cannot, as Europe sees it, be to arrive at farming areas of US proportions.

In America there are extensive areas where agro-industry tolerates neither a bush nor a tree in between fields, where there is nowhere a bird can nest and it is hardly worth while taking a walk.

The overriding consideration is to cut production costs and everything is subordinated to this principle.

Keeping a varied countryside and pretty villages that are worth living in can only be done at a price, and in the final analysis it is sure to mean that farming will be more expensive in Europe than in America, where industrial methods are preferred.

Within reasons Europe ought to be prepared to pay the price. In return it will retain a living environment of ines-

Continued on page 8

PERSPECTIVE

Which way now? The Social Democrats go through the shake-out process

Time on the Opposition benches is meant to be a time of regeneration. The Social Democrats, voted out by the electorate, are not resolving their differences as many expected that they would. Main issues in dispute are ties with the West and the 1979 Nato decision to station missiles in Europe and negotiate in the hope that deployment would not be necessary. The left of the party now claim that in these areas, they are in a large majority. Certainly, there has been one strong reaction to the course the SPD is taking. It came in the form of a letter from 10 Social Democratic academics including Professors Kurt Sontheimer, Thomas Nipperdey, Karl Kaiser, Hartmut Jäckel and Gesine Schwan. The accused party of encouraging left wingers who wanted to tread the middle path equidistant between Washington and Moscow. In this article, Lothar M. Marschall outlines for *Rheinischer Merkur/Christ und Welt* the conflicting currents juggling at the SPD.

The Christian Democrats took years to come to terms with losing power in Bonn in 1969.

The Social Democrats are having similar problems adapting, but this time the symptoms are different.

There is no question of a change of leadership, since both Helmut Schmidt and Herbert Wehner have retired to the ranks, and unlike the Christian Democrats in 1969, the SPD need not feel hit by the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.

A number of Social Democrats merily undermined Helmut Schmidt's position while he was Chancellor, fondly imagining that the SPD would gain fresh strength once it was no longer duty-bound to back an SPD Chancellor.

The assumption that a spell in Opposition would be like sabbatical leave, enabling the party to develop itself to the full, has since proved wishful thinking.

The main problem the SPD faces is that it is bedevilled by so many unsolved problems. Its most serious drawback at present is unquestionably the dispute over Germany's ties with the West and the dual-track Nato missiles-and-talks resolution.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Social Democrats' national executive committee has devoted itself almost entirely to this issue since the general election in March.

The debate on security policy held behind closed doors by the parliamentary party neither resolved differences of opinion within the SPD nor succeeded in papering over the extent of the differences.

The Social Democrats have changed a lot since the Nato resolution was passed, largely at Helmut Schmidt's behest, in December 1979.

The aim of the debate they not have been to hide the differences. Its avowed purpose was to arrive at a practicable choice of words until such time as the decision was reached in Geneva and to prevent the SPD's image on the issue from fraying any further.

There was an urgent need to call the party to order. The rank and file were clamouring more and more insistently for an immediate climb-down on Nato missile commitments.

The first move in this direction was made by the mid-Rhine region, the second by the Saar, and just before the debate was held the Bremen region voted in favour of a categorical "no" to the stationing of Pershing 2 and Cruise missiles in Germany.

Burgomaster Hans Koschnick of Bremen chose to illustrate his case with an argument that could hardly be outdone in intellectual simplicity.

He said he was on the side of the millions who wanted peace and not on that of the handful who felt a nuclear war could be won.

It is hard to believe that in 1979, the year the Nato resolution was reached, Herr Koschnick was deputy leader of the SPD and his Chancellor's faithful liege.

The party leaders felt obliged to intervene by the illogical position of those who rejected a negotiated settlement even before there was any sign of one appearing.

After all, Shadow Chancellor Hans-Jochen Vogel argued from time to time, the possibility of some sensible arrangement being negotiated in Geneva could not be ruled out.

A paper drawn up by the deputy leader of the parliamentary party, Horst Ehmke, and the foreign and security policy study group accordingly sought to keep the door open, at least optically.

Cumbersomely entitled Statement by the Bundestag SPD on Western Alliance Policy, the Strategy Debate and the Geneva Talks, it said:

"We must not ease pressure on the Soviet Union by declaring that we have no intention whatever of considering a Nato response to the stationing of SS-20s in Europe."

The paper even recalls the motives behind the Nato resolution:

"A point that prompted the December 1979 dual-track Nato resolution was the built-up of SS-20 missiles by the Soviet Union over the years regardless of our objection that they were in breach of key Western European security interests."

Then, after advising the United States to reactivate the "walk in the woods" proposals worked out by the two chief delegates in Geneva, America's Paul

Nitze and Russia's Yuri Kvitsinsky, the paper embarks on a volte-face.

The "walk in the woods" proposals last year envisaged a drastic reduction in the Soviet SS-20 potential in return for Western agreement to forgo deployment of the Pershing 2, of which the Russians are particularly afraid.

"A solution to outstanding issues," the SPD paper continues, "could be envisaged within the framework of the Start talks."

This provision made it possible for Social Democratic opponents of stationing the new missiles in Germany to endorse the paper as a whole.

The demand for the INF medium-range missile talks to lead straight into the Start talks on strategic arms reduction means in effect that the missiles need not be installed from this autumn.

It also means farewell to the dual-track decision in self-evident contradiction of the assurance that the Soviet Union must not be allowed to feel that the threat of stationing new missiles no longer applied.

The parliamentary party nonetheless gave the policy statement its approval, with nine MPs voting against it and eight abstaining.

It is interesting in this connection to note how Helmut Schmidt behaved. In several interviews the ex-Chancellor had given the impression that even he, as the "father of the dual-track decision," had changed his mind.

Representatives of the SPD's left wing promptly sought to capitalise on this. In the Social Democratic weekly, *Vorwärts*, Egon Bahr forecast that if the SPD were to have to decide that weekend on the missiles there would be a unanimous vote against them, from Helmut Schmidt to Oskar Lafontaine and from Hans Apel to Erhard Eppler.

Herr Schmidt was not prepared to accept this argument. Both on the national executive and in the parliamentary party he energetically objected to being claimed by the opponents of the dual-track decision.

He still felt the 1979 decision was right. But he is probably in a minority. Hans-Jochen Vogel said he felt Herr Bahr's estimate that 90 per cent of SPD members were currently opposed to the missiles was not unrealistic.

Willy Brandt said that if he had known then what he knew today he

would not have agreed to the decision at the time.

It would be understandable, then, of the tug-of-war within the party to limit it to the missiles issue in the narrowest sense of the term.

A week before the party met for its debate a memorandum drafted by 10 Social Democrats was published.

They included such names as those of Professorsonheimer, Thomas Nipperdey, Kaiser, Hartmut Jäckel and Schwan.

The memorandum did not use words about trends within the party in a manner similar to that of Philipp by Richard Löwenherz, but it was a clear view of the party's lack of a clear vision, a drop-out of industrial society, a drop-out of industrial society, a drop-out of industrial society.

But the main objection was policy trends within the party. The slogan "In the German had aimed at 'a kind of left-man Gaullism disowning with Western Europe and Na-

This had encouraged leftists who were keen to get the SPD line of equidistance between the line of Washington, the me-

The gulf-and-wormwood from SPD head office showed party leadership felt cut to the bone. The dons had adopted the Democrats' line of argument, and the SPD's line of argument.

But this carried little comfort. Johannes Rau, Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia and deputy leader of the SPD, argued along much the same line as the memorandum.

There must be no gaining of ground, Herr Rau said, that in any way prepared to join Western alliance.

Without its ties with the Federal Republic of Germany, the SPD would not be able to survive.

Early in 1971 Herbert Wehner said: "If the SPD allows itself to be manoeuvred into Opposition it will split. It will then be in the same position as the Labour Party in Britain."

Viewed with hindsight this would appear to be exaggerated. It is clear that by switching over to the SPD has by no means ended its contradictions.

Lothar M. Marschall
(Rheinischer Merkur/Christ und Welt)

Farm subsidies

Continued from page 5

timable value for man's physical and mental well-being.

Let it be noted at this point that Europe too has a lot to answer for in this context. Many mistakes have been made in breach of the need to maintain and take care of a natural living environment.

That is not to say that common Agricultural Policy should stay as it is. Subsidies must be thoroughly revised because no-one can afford the current surpluses.

Instead of rewarding farmers, mainly large-scale farmers, for output, agricul-

ture ought to be left in principle to the tender mercies of the free market.

Large-scale farmers can fend for themselves, whereas farmers who are unable to make ends meet but are deemed worthy of assistance for social or environmental reasons (mountain farmers, for instance) should be paid a straight subsidy to enable them to earn a reasonable income.

It would be up to politics to decide on long-term structural improvements. Europe's foremost aim must be to become self-supporting in all major farm products.

That would not only enable a suitable number of farmers to make ends meet. It is absolutely essential for a continent

that has been hit by two serious crises this century.

Over and above this objective, however, European agriculture should be able to hold its own in free competition on world markets.

Those who have a reasonable agricultural policy in mind must not just the egoistic well-being of farmers and farming officials. They must be bound to agree with the demands in principle if not to the extent.

Common Market taxpayers should hope that pressure from the EC States will at long last bring EC farmers to their senses.

Hans-Gert
(Süddeutsche Zeitung, 3 July 1983)

SPACE RESEARCH

German students' hopes in a hurtling drum

30 hours after the US space shuttle Challenger was launched from Cape Canaveral a series of scientific experiments began.

Results are keenly awaited in Munich. In Bensheim am der Bergstrasse, Hildesheim and Hanover.

Inside which five space experiments were devised — and years were in preparation — by five West German students aged between 16 and 20.

He began with a bright idea by a Munich aerospace firm, Kayser-Threde AG, in 1976 when Nasa could not guarantee that the mission would succeed.

The gulf-and-wormwood from SPD head office showed party leadership felt cut to the bone. The dons had adopted the Democrats' line of argument, and the SPD's line of argument.

But this carried little comfort. Johannes Rau, Minister of North Rhine-Westphalia and deputy leader of the SPD, argued along much the same line as the memorandum.

There must be no gaining of ground, Herr Rau said, that in any way prepared to join Western alliance.

Without its ties with the Federal Republic of Germany, the SPD would not be able to survive.

Early in 1971 Herbert Wehner said: "If the SPD allows itself to be manoeuvred into Opposition it will split. It will then be in the same position as the Labour Party in Britain."

Viewed with hindsight this would appear to be exaggerated. It is clear that by switching over to the SPD has by no means ended its contradictions.

Lothar M. Marschall
(Rheinischer Merkur/Christ und Welt)

Politics at first hand

Detailed and objective information is what you need if you are to hold your own on politics and world affairs: facts on which to base your own political viewpoint.

Aussenpolitik, the quarterly foreign affairs review, gives you facts at first hand for an annual DM50 plus p.p. Write today for a sample copy of the English edition, at no obligation, to the publishers, INTERPRESS GmbH, Holsteiner Kamp 14, D-2000 Hamburg 76, Federal Republic of Germany. Tel. (040) 229 06 09.

AUSSEN POLITIK

German Foreign Affairs Review

Name

Address

Profession

Editorial advisory board:
Heinrich Bechtoldt
Herbert von Borch
Kurt Georg Kiesinger
Klaus Riller
Walter Scheel
Helmut Schmidt
Richard von Weizsäcker

Challenger and its payload SPAS-01 ... artists impression.

(Photos: MBB)

Satellite was developed by Munich firm

Frankfurter
Neue Presse

On its latest mission the US space shuttle Challenger had on board an innovation for which manufacturers in the Federal Republic of Germany were largely responsible.

It was the first time the Challenger put a satellite into orbit that was later recovered and brought back to earth.

The SPAS-01, short for Shuttle Pallet Satellite, was designed and built by Messerschmitt-Bölkow-Blohm (MBB) in Ottobrunn, near Munich.

The Munich aerospace firm used its own resources while collaborating with Nasa. The Bonn Research and Technology Ministry lent financial support.

The 1.5-ton satellite with eight scientific instruments and three cameras on board started working while still on board the space shuttle.

America's first woman astronaut, Sally K. Ride, then operated a Canadian-built handler arm to push the satellite out of the loading bay and into space for an eight-hour flight.

The shuttle and the satellite will orbit the earth at an altitude of roughly 300km. The satellite will fly up to 300 metres clear of the Challenger before it is retrieved.

SPAS-01 will carry out several experiments in space while doing public relations work for Nasa: the three cameras will take still and movie photos of Challenger at work from various distances.

The photographs are being taken to mark Nasa's silver jubilee and may be screened live on TV.



The satellite cost roughly DM32m from the time the flight was booked with Nasa in May 1978 to take-off. Measuring equipment will cost an estimated DM25m more.

Project engineers used products already on the market wherever possible to cut costs.

They used carbon fibre sailboard masts to build the body of the satellite, while divers' bottles were used as gas storage containers in outer space.

dpu

Rudolf Metzler
(Süddeutsche Zeitung, 16 June 1983)



SPAS-01

More than 30 per cent of the 2,667 varieties of fern and flowers native to Germany are extinct or in serious danger of extinction.

This is one of the findings of a report which over 50 scientists have spent three and a half years drafting. It has just been submitted to Bonn Interior Minister Friedrich Zimmermann.

The project group was set up in autumn 1979 by the then Interior and Agriculture Ministers, Gerhart Baum and Josef Ertl.

It was a mixed group of politicians and scientists headed by Bonn biology professor Hartmut Bick.

One of the banal yet essential points on which an effective and economic environmental policy depends is that everything is interconnected.

Another is that linear thinking, the projection of short-term trends into the future, is inappropriate to an understanding of reality.

So the authors of the report have adopted a different approach and advocate planning on the basis of a cyclical outlook.

The report begins with a catalogue of damage the environment has already undergone. Over 30 per cent of the 2,667 varieties of ferns and flowers native to the Federal Republic are either extinct or likely to become extinct.

When one kind of plant goes, the report continues, 10 to 20 species of fauna die too, so interdependent are they ecologically.

Thus 55 per cent of mammals, 44 per cent of birds and 67 per cent of reptiles in the country are classified either as extinct or in danger of extinction.

Only a fraction of the 29,000 or so kinds of insect in Germany have been closely examined in respect of their survival prospects.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Doomsday report's long list of fated plants

But of these 3,715 species a third are said to be in danger of extinction.

If an ecological action programme is to make any sense, the report says, immediate action must be taken to protect species and their biotopes, or natural habitats.

Only if the demands listed are implemented might most of Germany's surviving flora and fauna be expected to survive. But for many endangered species help, if it comes, will come too late.

The scientists call for classification, evaluation and preservation of biotopes with a rich variety of species in all parts of the country.

These "biological islands" must be surveyed for size, location, ecological surroundings and possibilities of interlinking.

"What is needed," the report states, "is a network dense enough to ensure the exchange of genetic potential and the survival of migratory species."

The biotope protection programme must also list minimum sizes and types of biotope and ensure that they are not, as far as possible, put to other uses.

The authors are particularly insistent on the need to protect the mud-flats along the North Sea coast. Dikes and embankments, they say, must only be built on condition that the mud-flats are not reduced in surface area.

The Bonn government must no longer provide funds from the estates

earmarked for agricultural structure improvements and coastal protection.

Otherwise the Federal government would be shouldering partial responsibility for the factual destruction of the mud-flats.

A realistic ceiling must also be set for the amount of recreational use to which the mud-flats should be put. Similar limits ought, it is argued, to be set for the Alps.

Nature conservation areas and national parks must not be changed so much by extraneous influences that their target, to conserve nature, is no longer possible.

The report thus calls for buffer zones to be set up to extend sufficient protection until such time as uses are laid down once and for all.

Just as listed areas and national parks must not be put to uses that jeopardise the features that are to be protected, so uses that afford protection must be encouraged.

Agricultural chemicals would naturally be banned, whereas hunting and fishing would be permitted, but only if there was no other way of regulating the animal population.

Tourism should, as a rule, be forbidden, visitors being restricted so as to ensure they do no damage.

Ecologists stress the importance of safeguards for buffer zones to ensure that they are not the source of harmful influences.

The measures they have in mind would be aimed at ruling out pollution such as industrial fallout, traffic, lowering of the ground water level, fertilisers and pesticides.

Yet nature conservation alone is not enough to save nature in all its variety. Fifty-four per cent of the surface area of the Federal Republic of Germany is farmed.

Serious ecological mistakes are made in the agricultural sector. The laws of nature are criminally disregarded. Conventional farming, the report says, "has a detrimental influence on the aims of preserving species and the soil."

The experts thus call for a network of hedges, banks and mini-biotopes to be maintained or laid out. They will in part help to ensure agricultural output on a lasting basis.

This is a task that ought normally to be carried out in the course of consolidation and reallocation of arable land, whereas the trend so far has been to destroy structures that are ecologically essential.

The use of pesticides and fertilisers must be prohibited in these mini-biotopes areas, the experts say. They would soonest see them used only by farmers.

Roadside vegetation, parks and gardens ought not to be treated with pesticides and fertilisers at all. A Plant Protection Act needs passing.

In farming the report would like to see the introduction of new pesticides that spare useful insects and animals. New methods of tilling and harvesting are advocated. So is careful treatment of marginal flora and fauna.

The report proposes a duty on proprietary fertilisers to prevent overfertilisation, or alternatively a fertiliser ceiling, especially for market gardeners and vineyards.

Limits must definitely be imposed on

the use of nitrogen-based fertilisers to protect water resources. In fact they might even have to be banned.

The Waste Disposal Act makes legal provision for offenders who use too much.

Less intensive agriculture had at a cost. To some extent it can be argued that landowners are bound to meet the cost in the interest of society.

But the cost, in terms of production, would be negligible. The payer inasmuch as farmer would no longer be produced.

For the land the experts call in terms of a constitutional amendment to make landowners under a heavy ecological consideration, just as property-owners have a riding obligation to abide by considerations.

They feel consideration should be given to an environmental tax to finance swifter measures to reduce the toxin count in exhausts.

More environmental law need to be used more flexibly that environmental protection effective.

More careful consideration be given to the efficacy of legal measures before they are put to full use.

The report says the state has part to play. It and local major customers and an the market.

It is up to them to foster environmentally sound, environmentally sound, environmentally sound products. The experts envisage establishment of an environmental audit along consumer foundation to test and grade products.

Environmental tests mandatory before the go-ahead for the manufacture of many and production facilities, and curbing and generating equipment.

The report deals at length with uses and consumption of energy. It says, must change inspection procedures for power lines to provide and added new energy-saving techniques.

Industrial development envisaged mainly "in smaller work systems in the framework of verified craft technology at the of invention."

Three sectors are given special emphasis:

- biotechnology to produce medicines, foodstuffs and energy;
- development of energy independent of commodity supplies;
- and low-energy production techniques using recycling and feed-back.

The economics of water supply distribution are said to be in total revision. Sewage and must no longer use the rivers as part-system.

Marginal areas where water unspoiled by man must be kept. Conventional waste disposal is criticised, especially the failure to encourage full use of recycling techniques.

Waste should not be produced such quantities. Research should be devoted to materials that are an environmental hazard and their production should be limited if need be.

The report's proposals are all, its authors say, on a comprehensive understanding of the system. It is to dealing satisfactorily with mental problems.

Rudolf Bick (Rheinischer Merkur/Chancen)

EXHIBITIONS

Some gaps in an otherwise strong collection of Egyptian history

exhibition on Egyptian art and history is being held in Heidelberg

section concentrates on Egypt the pyramids and the second on the Pharaonic millennia.

loan items are from two universities (Heidelberg and Tübingen) museums (Hanover, Vienna, Berlin, Stuttgart, and Frankfurt's), a well-known private collection in Lucerne, and the Munich Collection of Egyptian Art.

can therefore be claimed that the exhibition gives a good idea of what

missioned task put before them. And it was normal that nature of these tasks was determined in most cases by religious systems. The visitor to such an exhibition, therefore, should really be familiar with this fact in order to fully comprehend the work of art before him.

Another essential prerequisite for understanding the exhibits is knowledge of the historical context surrounding this advanced civilisation.

The Sahara exhibition in Cologne in 1978, for example, suggested that the area around the Nile might have been gradually colonised by peoples from the Sahara region. The emphasis in Heidelberg is on Egyptian art, even though it is treated separately in the exhibition's general context. Explanations in one exhibition catalogue (*Bilder für die Ewigkeit*, DM18) are limited to analyses of individual items. The religious and historical context is only hinted at. The exhibition's second catalogue *Ägypten*

vor den Pyramiden, DM12, has more to offer in this respect. It goes into greater detail on the historical developments between the Egyptian Palaeolithic Age to the "pre-Christian" age and the age of the "Unification of the Empire" (round about 3000 BC).

It is very well illustrated, one of the most striking pictures being that of the magnificent stylised woman dancer from Upper Egypt.

Another positive aspect in this second catalogue are the pictorial references to the excavations by the Cairo branch office of the German Archaeological Institute. There is also mention of the (financially decisive) role played by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*

in Bonn. However, the visitor is still left confused. He is not informed about the meaning of terms such as "old", "middle-aged", "recent", "empire". Nothing is said about the 31 dynasties before Alexander the Great, where they came from, how they developed historically, and what implications each dynasty had. All the visitor needs is some kind of reference point covering the basic historical facts. A mere list of dates is not enough. A summary of the most important religious concepts is also missing.

There are doubts as to whether Egyptian artists consciously "created art". It is more likely that most of them were concerned with fulfilling the com-

mon artistic treasures, there are in human-speaking world.

Many items leave the beholder speechless because of the huge time span.

Visitors may feel they understand the exhibits, but they still must look in the catalogue to discover exactly what they are admiring: a God, a king, a priest, a scholar of literature?

The impressions are often over-whelming. A small king's head made of wood for example, 12.8 cm high and dated at about 1400BC, is evidence of the magnificent skills of the master craftsmen of this period. The young depicted by this sculpture has an expression of knowledge, hence sorrow, or contempt, engraved on his tiny

features. Another example: "Head of a Dicer", 16.5 cm high and dating about 1970BC, a facial expression of amazement and fright, rigidly fixed the panic-like gaze.


For non-expert visitors many of the exhibits leave questions unanswered.

The head of the dice-thrower, for example, is one of the many examples from Heidelberg which proves that each generation could produce art of comparable standard and quality. The almost 2,000-year-old sculpture is reminiscent of many ways of European Romanesque sculptures.

Regardless of the content of any particular civilisation, therefore, it is quite possible to talk of a "development", whereas there is no such thing as "higher development" in the sense of more advanced civilisation.

English-language leaflet tells the visitor in keywords what is to be seen in the display cases. A German version would have definitely been more useful to many visitors. It is a shame that the organisers failed to consider such basic details, particularly in view of the many questions raised by the exhibition. Next time, they should not just be content with merely "presenting" the pieces.

Walter Seib (Frankfurter Neue Presse, 18 June 1983)



Limestone group of figurines 44 cm high from Egypt about 2,300 BC. (Photos: Catalogue)

Demonstration of increase in African self-awareness

Hildesheim is continuing its exotic archaeological series by presenting "Artistic Treasures from Old Nigeria" this year. Two years ago it held a Chinese exhibition.

Hildesheim was a powerful diocese back in the Middle Ages, and its magnificent exhibitions have enabled it to regain some of the aura it once had.

During the Second World War a great deal of the old part of the town was destroyed.

The Nigeria exhibition is the first time that the early artistic secrets from the area along the Niger, the "silver river", have been shown in this part of the world.

It has already been presented in New York, Oslo, London and Stockholm.

An "Art along the Niger" exhibition shown in 1971 only dealt with a part-

aspect of the current exhibition. This goes to confirm to what extent collection material from the present state of Nigeria has increased during these twelve years and how greatly the claim by Nigeria to its own civilisation has grown.

"This development has run parallel to the general increase in African self-awareness. The assertion by the well-known Africa researcher, Leo Frobenius, who expresses his doubts as to whether the artificial language in this area has not in fact come from outside the region, is emphatically rejected.

The opinion based on chronicles, travel reports and other finds that non-negroid groups from the Mediterranean area, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Persia, Egypt and Arabia, which travelled to this area on caravan routes, spread their techniques and artistic ideas seems to be shaken.

The exhibition is split up into six sections, ranging from the pre-Christian Nok terracotta, the products found in Igbo-Ukwu, Ife, Owo and Benin, to the Tsoede bronzes.

It is difficult for Europeans to recognise the differences in style, even though they may see the differences in techniques used.

The relief, woods from the famous punitive expedition by British soldiers to the Kingdom of Benin in 1897 are also on display.

As opposed to European art, which reflects the social changes undergone in each epoch, West African art objects are of a more static calibre. They are ritualised expressions, although admittedly of the greatest perfection.

There is a marked cultic rigidity even in the way animals are portrayed, and art still serves the Oba (king) and the Alaja (priest).

In view of the fact that the iron-melting techniques used for the oldest Nok

Continued on page 12

Meteorological stations all over the world



supplied the data arranged in spot-at-a-glance tables in these new reference works. They include details of air and water temperature, precipitation, humidity, sunshine, physical stress of climate, wind conditions and frequency of thunderstorms.

These figures compiled over the years are invaluable both for planning journeys to distant countries and for scientific research.

Basic facts and figures for every country in the world form a preface to the tables. The emphasis is on the country's natural statistics, on climate, population, trade and transport.

The guides are handy in size and flexibly bound, indispensable for daily use in commerce, industry and the travel trade.

Four volumes are available:

North and South America, 172 pp., DM 22.80;

Asia/Australia, 240 pp., DM 24.80;

Africa, 130 pp., DM 19.80;

Europe/USSR, 240 pp., DM 24.80.

Look it up in Brockhaus

F. A. Brockhaus, Postfach 1709; D-6200 Wiesbaden 1

0242150

